

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



<b>Applicant Name:</b>	<b>Anderson Community Schools</b>
<b>Proposal Ranking:</b>	55
<b>Average Score</b>	89.25 / 125

## Proposal Strengths:

- The applicant provided a clear application showing the overview of the program, partners in the desired program and overall flow of the application, itself. The applicant provided clear data showing the need for the program within their community and demonstrates the effectiveness of the current program already established. Applicant outlines the data of the program broken down by school site, grade levels to be serviced, free/ reduced populations, and demographic served. In addition, the applicant shows an understanding of the overall management of the grant, if awarded and has strong established processes and guidelines within the district's central office. The applicant shows clear objectives and goals for the program, how they will obtain those goals and the means in which the goals will be met and evaluated each year. The applicant describes and outlines the various testing platforms, evaluation techniques and shows a strong sense of understanding that the relationship with the school day staff is key for meeting those objectives. In addition, applicant provides a plan for evaluation each year which will allow the staff to understand the strengths of program annually and how they can grow year by year. The applicant shows strong support from the community partners and that the partners are committed to carrying out the vision and mission of the 21st CCLC Grant, if awarded. Overall, the applicant provides a strong narrative and a clear focus for meeting the needs of students and serving the community, at large.

## Proposal Weaknesses:

- No origin of partnership mentioned during qualifications section. Parents and Students were involved in the needs assessment, Didn't mention how the partners were involved in the application process. Didn't mention the priority area of STEAM often, did see it with LEGO robotics. There weren't levels of staff mentioned for the professional development plans. No parental involvement mentioned in the program design.
- At one point in the application, it appeared the applicant had copied and pasted from a previous section (see pages 12 and 16). For a federal competitive grant, the did not present in a strong manner and is not best-practice for a strong application. This portion could have been rewritten or re-worded in a way in which the reviewer could possibly see this particular piece of data or narrative from a different perspective or with new insight. In addition, there were a few sections that applicant could have included just a few more sentences to obtain full points (please see next section for specific examples).
- Application is missing a few points of key information that was requested. Applicant did

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



not complete the program activities chart in full detail nor the professional development plan. As a reviewing, I am still unclear about the structure of the program. The application mentioned several great community partners but did not address the programming schedule that included the partners.

## Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:

- MOU's
- Program Design
- Professional Development
- Application Organization
- Cover Page
- Program Qualification
- Need for Project
- Partnerships